



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

I do not find what he said: I find that he wept. I read of tears. I do not read of satisfaction.

Chapter 2, also;

"Tears wash out a sin, which it is a shame to confess with the voice."

Chapter 3, also the Prophet (Psalm 51, v. 19).

"The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit; a contrite and humbled heart, O God, thou wilt not despise."

Chapter 4, also (Psalm 52, v. 5).

"I said, I will confess against myself my unrighteousness to the Lord, and thou forgavest the impiety of my sin."

Which Augustine explaining, says:

Chapter 5.

"Great is the goodness of God, that He should have forgiven sins on a promise alone. He does not yet pronounce with his mouth, and yet God already hears in his heart, because that he was saying [in his heart] was as it were to pronounce something. For the wish is reckoned for the work."

Gratian then gives a variety of passages from the Roman civil law, to show how the attempt to commit a crime was punished by that law, even where the crime was not committed (chapters 6 to 21); and passages from the Fathers supporting the same principle (chapters 22 to 30).

The object of these chapters is evidently to show that the intention of the mind is to be regarded in acquitting or condemning, rather than the outward act.

Gratian goes on to represent how that party in the Church argued from these authorities:—"It appears more clear than light that sins are remitted by contrition of the heart, not by confession of the mouth."

Gratian then gives two passages (chapters 31 and 32) from Prosper, as he says, but really from Julianus Pomerius, the substance of which is, that by judging ourselves we may obtain pardon, without the knowledge of any other person.

Gratian proceeds thus with the argument of those who hold this opinion:—

"This also is proved by that authority of the prophet (Ezekiel, ch. 33): 'In whatever hour the sinner shall have been converted and groaned, &c.' for it is not said, 'shall have confessed with his mouth,' but only, 'shall be converted and groan, he shall live in life; he shall not die.'"

Gratian proceeds with the argument:—

"Hence, also, the prophet says:—

Chapter 33.

"Rend your hearts, and not your garments' (Joel, ch. 2, 13).

"Showing that sins are remitted in contrition of the heart, which is understood in the rending of it, and not in confession of the mouth, which is part of outward satisfaction, which is called the rending of garments, understanding the whole by a part."

"Hence, also, by the same prophet, the Lord says:—

Chapter 34.

"Be turned to me with your whole heart, and I will be turned to you.' For conversion is called as it were a turning of the heart from every side. But if our heart is turned on every side from evil to God, straight it obtains the fruit of its conversion, that God being turned from His anger to mercy, should grant the pardon of sin, for which He was at first preparing vengeance. Whence it is given to be understood that even while the mouth is silent we can obtain pardon. Hence even those lepers whom the Lord commanded that they should show themselves to the priests were cleansed in the way, before they came to the priests. From which fact, doubtless, it is given to be understood that before we show our faces to the priests, that is, confess our sins, we are cleansed from the leprosy of sin."

Hence, also, that the Lord might show that the sinner is cleansed, not by the judgment of the priest, but by the bounty of Divine Grace. He healed the leper by touching him, and afterwards commanded him to offer to the priest the sacrifice of the law. For the leper is touched when the mind of the sinner, enlightened by being looked on by divine goodness, is pricked. Whence, Peter, after his third denial, the Lord looking on him, poured forth bitter tears, by which He washed out

Utrum sola cordis contritione et secreta satisfactione, absque oris confessione quique possit Deo satisfacere, redeamus. Sunt enim qui dicunt, quilibet criminalis veniam sine confessione facta ecclesie et sacerdoti iudicio posse promereri, juxta illud Ambrosii super Lucam, ad cap. 22.

Cap. 1.

Petrus doluit et fleuit, quia erravit, ut homo. Non invenio quid dixerit; invenio quod fleverit. Lacrimas ejus lego, satisfactionem non lego.

c. 2. Item.

Lacrimae lavant delictum, quod voce pudor est confiteri.

c. 3. Item. Prophetia.

Sacrificium Deo spiritus contribulatus; cor contritum et humillimum, Deus, non despicies.

c. 4. Item.

Dixi, confitebor adversum me in injustitiam meam Domino, et tu remisisti impietatem peccati mei.

Quod Augustinus exponens, ait.

Cap. 5.

Magna pietas Dei, ut ad solam promissionem peccata dimiserit. Nondum pronuntiat ore, et tamen Deus jam audit in corde, quia ipsum dicere quasi quoddam pronuntiare est. Votum enim pro opere reputatur.—Deeet. Caus. xxxiii., qu. 3, Dist. 1.

Luce clarior constat cordis contritione, non oris confessione, peccata dimitti.

Gratian is very often incorrect in giving the names of the authors. Hoc idem probatur auctoritate illa prophetia: "In quacunque hora peccator fuerit conversus, et iugum meruit, &c." Non enim dicitur, ore confessus fuerit, sed tantum, conversus fuerit et iugum meruit, vita vivet, et non morietur.—C. 32, latter end.

the sin of his denial. The leper shows himself to the priest when the penitent confesses his sin to the priest. He offers the sacrifice of the law, when he executes in fact the satisfaction imposed on him by the judgment of the Church. But he is cleansed before he can come to the priest, when the pardon of sin is granted through contrition of heart, before confession of the mouth.

We regret to have to leave out any of this interesting argument, but our space will not admit the whole.

It goes on to argue (ch. 35), from the teaching of St. Augustine about the commencement of the work of grace, and concludes—"Since, therefore, as has been proved, we are raised up by grace, and made the children of light, before confession, it evidently appears that sin is remitted by contrition of the heart alone, without confession of the mouth" (ch. 36).

The argument then proceeds upon I. John, 3, 9:—"Whosoever loveth not, abideth in death." Either the person confessing loves, and is passed already from death to life, or he does not love, and remains in death in spite of his confession.

The whole argument is wound up thus:—"Sin, which is proved to have been remitted before, is, therefore, not remitted in confession. Confession is, therefore, made to show repentance, not to obtain pardon; and as circumcision was given to Abraham for a sign of righteousness, and not for a cause of justification, so confession to the priest is offered as a sign of pardon received, not as a cause of remission to be received" (ch. 37).

Gratian then proceeds to the argument on the opposite side (chapters 38 to 87):—"Others, on the contrary, testify, saying, that no one can be cleansed from sin without confession of the mouth and satisfaction of work, if he has time for satisfaction" (ch. 37, part 2).

Gratian gives this argument with equal fairness, but space does not allow us to follow it. We can only say that many of its authorities which seem most to the purpose are not genuine; that many prove little to the point; and none suppose the priest to say "I absolve thee," but only that "the priest approaches as a petitioner for the sins of the penitents" (ch. 61).

At chapter 87 Gratian introduces the first party, in reply, asserting that some of the authorities produced by the advocates of confession, Chrysostom and Prosper for instance, were plainly perverted (which, indeed, cannot be denied); and that others were not to the point. The following comment on a passage from St. Augustine quoted by the other party to prove confession necessary is a good specimen:—"No one is affirmed to be cleansed from sin unless he has suffered punishment of sin. But it is one thing to confess sin to the priest, and to make satisfaction for sin at his judgment, and it is another thing to confess to God in the heart, and to punish sin in oneself by secret satisfaction. For penitence is, as Augustine says, grief of the heart, by which each punishes in himself what he has offended" (ch. 87, part 2).

Gratian then introduces the advocates of confession, coming in again with their reply; and a very forcible reply it seems at first sight, supported by a long quotation from St. Augustine, entirely on their side (ch. 88); but the passage, when examined, turns out not to be St. Augus-

<sup>1</sup> Hinc etiam propheta ait:

Cap. 32.

Scinditis corda vestra, et non vestimenta. Ostendens in contritione cordis, quam in ejusdem scissione intelligitur, non in confessione oris, quam pars est exterioris satisfactionis, quam scissuram vestium nominavit, a parte totum intelligens, peccata dimittit.

Hinc etiam per eundem prophetam Dominus ait:

Cap. 34.

Convertimini ad me in toto corde vestro, et convertar ad vos. Conversio autem dicitur quasi cordis undique versio. Si autem cor nostrum undique, a malo ad Deum vertitur, mox sine conversionis fructum meretur, ut Deus ab ira sua ad misericordiam conversus peccati prestat indulgentiam, cuius primo preparabat vindictam. Unde datur intelligi, quod etiam ore taceente veniam consequi possumus. Hinc etiam leprosi illi, quibus Dominus precepit ut ostenderent se sacerdotibus, in itinere antequam ad sacerdos venissent, mundati sunt. Ex quo facto nimirum datur intelligi quod antequam sacerdotibus ora nostra ostendamus, id est peccata nostra confiteamur a lepra peccati mundamur.

Hinc etiam ut Dominus ostenderet, quod non sacerdotali iudicio, sed largitate divine gratie peccator emundatur, leprosum tangendo mundavit, et postea sacerdoti sacrificium ex lege offerre precepit. Leprosus enim tangitur, quum respectu divine pietatis mens peccatorum illustrata compungitur. Unde post trinum negationem Petrus, Domino eam respiciente, profudit amaras lacrimas, quibus culpam negationis sue diluit. Leprosus semetipsum sacerdoti representat, dum peccatum suum sacerdoti ponitens confitetur. Sacrificium ex lege offert dum satisfactionem ecclesie iudicio sibi imponit factis exsequitur. Sed antequam ad sacerdotem perveniat, emundatur, dum per contritionem cordis ante confessionem oris peccati veniam indulgetur.

quum ergo ante confessionem, ut probatum est, sumus reusculati per gratiam, et filii lucis facti, evidenter apparet, quod sola cordis contritione, sine confessione oris, peccatum remittitur.

Non ergo in confessione peccatum remittitur, quod jam remissum esse probatur. Hic itaque confessio ad ostensionem penitentiae, non ad imputationem venit, et sicut circumcisio data est Abraham in signum iustitiae, non in causam justificationis, sic confessio sacerdoti offertur in signum venie acceptae, non in causam remissionis acceptae.

Alii e contrario testantur, dicentes sine confessione oris et satisfactione operis neminem a peccato posse mundari, si tempus satisfaciendi habuerit.

Sacerdoti, qui pro delictis penitentium precator accedit.—Pope Leo I.

Nullus enim asserit ut peccato mundari, nisi peccati passus fuerit penam. Sed aliud est peccatum sacerdoti confiteri, et ejus arbitrio de peccato satisfacere; atque aliud Deo corde confiteri, et secreta satisfactione peccatum in se ipso punire. Est enim penitentia (ut ait Augustinus) dolor cordis, quo quisque in se punit quod deliquit.

tine's at all. It was thus that men were deceived in that age, into adopting novel doctrines by false testimonies attributed to ancient fathers.

Having thus given the arguments on both sides with equal fairness, Gratian says:—

"We have briefly expounded by what authorities, and by what support of reasons, either opinion of satisfaction and confession can be supported. But to which of these opinions we should rather adhere is left to the judgment of the reader. For either opinion has for supporters wise and religious men" (ch. 89, at the end.)

The Decretum of Gratian was "corrected," after the time of the Council of Trent, by a Commission of Cardinals and doctors appointed by the Pope. This commission (commonly called "The Roman Correctors") has left us notes upon Gratian. To the passage last given, they have appended this note:—"To the judgment of the reader; it is most certain, and must be held for most certain, that sacramental confession of mortal sin is necessary, to be used in that manner and time which is appointed in the Council of Trent after other councils." (Note on the place.)

It is truly most certain that this was the law established by the Council of Trent, in the year 1551; and partly established before by the third Council of Lateran, in the year 1215. It is equally certain that Gratian could find no such law of the Church of Rome in the twelfth century, and, therefore, Gratian had nothing for it but to leave the question "to the judgment of the reader."

This seems to us now, as it seemed to Gratian then, a fair exercise of "private judgment;" and it proves beyond all question that in the twelfth century the Church of Rome had not yet come to any judgment in favour of the necessity of confession to a priest, in order to obtain pardon of sin.

In respect of this question, it seems that in the twelfth century one half of the Church of Rome were right good Protestants; and the other half were as yet but indifferent Romanists, having as yet no notion that the priest should say, "I absolve thee."

How many of the modern doctrines of the Church of Rome have we already proved to have had their first establishment in the Church of Rome herself after the twelfth century; we shall probably count them up in a separate article some time hereafter. We think this inquiry deserving of the serious consideration of Roman Catholics.

This instance may serve to correct an error which many Protestants fall into. It is common for Protestants to imagine that the Church of the middle ages was wholly dark, and devoid of the knowledge of the gospel of the grace of God. We think the bold and vigorous statement which Gratian gives in his treatise on penitence of the doctrines of a large portion of the Church in his day is well calculated to correct this serious error. The Church of Rome after the Council of Trent, in which all her members were bound to profess errors, is a very different thing from the Church of the twelfth century, in which men were, at least on many points, at liberty, which liberty many used, to profess the truth.

## THE CHURCH OF ITALY.

If the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome were an institution of our Lord Himself, and not, as alleged by Protestants, the tardy result of continual encroachment on the rights of other Churches, the farther back we went, the more clearly we should be able to trace the powers of that Church as undisputed and universally recognised by all others. If, on the contrary, our Lord did not institute any such supremacy, but intended each Church to mould its own constitution, subject only to the divine verities recorded in the sacred Scriptures, without being subject to any supreme local see, then we may fairly presume that if we go back behind the period of successful encroachment, we shall find other Churches acting independently of the Church of Rome, and denying her right to dictate either in points of doctrine or practice to those who were not (according to the divine laws and institutions of Christianity) subordinate to them.

A priori, before consulting the records of history, two cases are equally possible, and might each account for the actual state of things existing at the present day. The one is, that in the origin of Christianity, Rome was universally admitted to be the mistress of all other Churches, but that in later and more degenerate times, as heresies and schisms arose, a considerable number of other local Churches rebelled against her lawful and divine authority; the other, that our Lord and His Apostles gave the Church of Rome no supremacy over other Churches, but that that Church availed itself of its superior wealth and favourable situation at the ancient seat of empire, gradually to usurp a power which Christ never gave her, and that thus she was, by a gradual system of persevering encroachment, at last able to grasp at universal power over the whole Church, and practically for a considerable period to exercise it over a large part of it.

Which of these two theories is borne out by historical

Quibus auctoritatibus, vel quibus rationum firmitate utraque sententia satisfactoris et confessionis innitur, in medium breviter exposuimus. Cui autem harum potius adhaerendum sit, lectoris iudicio reservatur. Utraque enim fautores habet sapientes et religiosos viros.

Lectoris iudicio: Certissimum est, et pro certissimo habendum, peccati mortalis necessarium esse confessionem sacramentalem, eo modo ac tempore adhibitam, quo in concilio Tridentino post alia concilia est constitutum.

facts is the question we now propose to ourselves to discuss, and as we intend to resort to no disputable authorities, we would fain hope the discussion will not be without interest or profit to every sincere student of truth, whether he calls himself a Roman Catholic or Protestant. It is obviously one which will require a considerable space to deal with it satisfactorily, and cannot be summarily disposed of in a single article.

Let us begin with Italy.

If the Church of Rome were by Divine appointment the mistress of all other Churches, we may fairly conclude that those of Italy, at least, were no exceptions, and that her Divine supremacy was there, at least, at all times universally acknowledged.

The dogmas of faith are by a certain class of theologians in modern times admittedly not as old as Christianity, but asserted to have been from time to time developed by the Church as Christianity grew and became matured under its fostering care. But here, at least, such a doctrine is inapplicable; and to introduce the theory of development to explain the growth of the Church itself, would simply be to admit the Protestant solution of the difficulty, by tracing the supremacy of the Pope to encroachment instead of Divine right.

The question in this aspect is simply one of historical fact, and must obviously be decided simply by historical evidence.

We may premise also that the burthen of proof lies naturally upon those who assert the supremacy. It does not legitimately lie on its opponents to disprove it. We shall go, however, beyond what can fairly be required of us as protesters against the dogma, and for the present shall confine our inquiries, as we have said, to Italy.

Is it, then, historically true that the whole of Italy has from the earliest times acknowledged the supremacy of Rome?

We beg the attention of our Roman Catholic readers to the historical facts which follow:—

Italy from very early times was divided into two great provinces—1st, the *Italic Diocese*, which comprehended the present kingdom of Lombardy, and the other countries subject to the empire south of the Danube, of which Milan was the metropolis; and, 2ndly, that of Rome, which comprised Tuscany, the present States of the Church, Naples, Sicily, and the Mediterranean islands of Sardinia and Corsica, usually known as the *Loca Suburbicaria*.

Under the Roman empire the former was placed under the civil government of a *Prætorian prefect*; the latter under the jurisdiction of a *City prefect*, whose power extended not only to the city itself, but to those adjacent provinces which were usually called the Suburbanic, or suburban regions, and which we find from a rescript of the Emperor Severus extended to a distance of one hundred miles round Rome.

This civil division, we shall find, was in early times adopted as the measure of ecclesiastical jurisdiction also, the Bishop of Rome having sway over the city of Rome and the Suburbanic provinces annexed to it, while the bishop of the *Italic Diocese*, of which the metropolis was Milan, had undisputed sway over the rest of Italy.

Thus we find the earliest ecclesiastical historians, Theodoret, Eusebius, and Sulpitius Severus, and also the most ancient versions of the canons of the General Council of Nice, treating the matter.

Theodoret styles Dionysius Bishop of Milan, Bishop of the metropolis of Italy,\* and refers to him and Liberius, Bishop of Rome, as having been seized and driven into exile because they would not coincide in the Arian heresy. St. Athanasius, in like manner, in his history of the Arians, and also in his second apology before the Council of Milan, speaks of the bishops assembled from Rome and Italy, meaning by the latter the bishops of the *Italic diocese*, as contradistinguished from those of the diocese of Rome.

Sulpitius Severus, in his sacred history, referring to the heretic Priscilian and his associates, says—"They addressed themselves to Damasus, Bishop of Rome, and Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, as the bishops who had the greatest authority in those days;" plainly treating them as the respective heads of the two great dioceses already referred to.

So Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History,† tells us that when Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, refused to give

\* There has been a good deal of controversy about the real extent of the "Suburbanic provinces," and whether Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica were not too remote to come under that division. Possibly, if it were necessary to discuss the exact boundaries, we should find that the power of the Bishop of Rome before the rise of the patriarchal power extended only to the Suburbanic places which were under the jurisdiction of the *Præfectus urbis*, but that when his patriarchal jurisdiction arose, it became coextensive with that of the *Vicarius urbis*, who had ten provinces under his government, including the Sicilies, Corsica, and Sardinia, as well as the Suburbanic places. For our present purpose, however, it is quite sufficient for our purpose, if it did not include the whole of Italy, but excluded the *Italic Diocese* in which Aquileia, Milan, and Ravenna were chief cities.

† Phil. Bertrii. *Pithanon Diatribæ*. Tolosæ, 1608. p. 26. "Quapropter Italiæ magistratus, ubi de capite Senatoris agebatur, ex suburbanis provinciis ad Præfectum urbis; ex aliis ad Præfectum prætorio Italiæ referebant.—L. 13. C. Theod. de appell. Stante imperio manserunt semper suburbicariæ regiones, quarum metropolis fuit Roma, ut reliquæ Italiæ Mediolanum."

\* Theodoret. *Ecl. Hist.*, l. 2, c. 15, p. 91. Valensis edition, 1695.

† St. Athanasius *Opera* Tom. I., p. 363. Ben. Ed. Paris, 1690.

Histor. A. I., ad Monachos, n. 38.

† Dionysius episcopus Mediolanus, est autem et ipsa Metropolis Italica.

† Theodoret, *Ecl. Hist.* Lib. II., c. 15, p. 91. Amstel. 1695.

† Lib. 2, p. 444. Lugdun. 1647.

† Lib. 7, c. 30, p. 231. Valensis edition, 1695.

Domnus possession of that church, an appeal was made, not to the Bishop of Rome, but to the Emperor Aurelian, who referred it to the decision of the Bishops of Rome and Italy. We might easily multiply instances, but we think we need not heap up authorities on this head of the argument, as Rufinus, the ecclesiastical historian, seems to place the matter beyond doubt when, in epitomizing the sixth canon of the first General Council (that of Nice, A.D. 325, at which no less than 318 bishops attended), the very earliest record of the privileges of the Roman See, he tells us that "according to ancient custom, the Bishop of Alexandria had the care of the churches in Egypt, just as the Bishop of Rome had the care and charge of the *suburbanic churches*."

That Rufinus could not have been mistaken in the sense of the Nicene canon, or in the province of the Bishop of Rome, is plain, because he was himself an Italian, born not above twenty years after the Council of Nice, and a presbyter of the Church of Aquileia, a city in constant intercourse with Rome—a writer whose works have always been deemed of the highest credit, and approved of by Popes, Fathers, and Councils, and who could never have dared to limit the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome to such narrow limits as the suburbanic regions, had not his power at the time been notoriously known to have been confined within these limits.

Justellus also gives us a very ancient paraphrase of the Nicene canons, from which the same thing appears—viz., that the Bishop of Rome had a primacy over the province of Rome and the Suburbanic places by ancient custom; and, in like manner, the Bishop of Alexandria had power over Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, and the Bishop of Antioch in the countries adjoining it; and the Greek scholiasts reiterate substantially the same thing.

To come, however, to more modern authorities, we think it will not be difficult to show that the primacy of the Popes was disputed for many centuries after the Council of Nice, throughout every part of Italy which lay outside the boundaries we have already mentioned.

Let us try this by taking individual cases. Three of the most distinguished cities of northern Italy, outside the borders of the Suburbanic provinces, were Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna.

We shall first consider the case of the greatest of them—Milan. According to usage of modern times, the Archbishops of Milan are indisputably subject to the Pope; and if any of the metropolitan churches we have named were, in the early ages, subject to the Patriarchate of Rome, we might naturally expect that the See of Milan, rendered famous as having been the see of the great St. Ambrose, one of the Fathers of the Church, and a Saint in the Roman Calendar, would have been so.

That this was not the case, however, is capable of the clearest demonstration. We must necessarily limit our proofs within a reasonable compass, and our first witness shall be a Pope—Pelagius I.—who, writing in the year 555, distinctly confesses that it was then an ancient custom that the Bishops of Milan did not come to Rome for ordination, but that they and the Bishops of Aquileia were accustomed to ordain one another.

Pelagius, however, like other Popes, was anxious to reduce the Bishops of Milan to dependence upon him; and shortly after (as appears from another epistle) he actually invoked the secular power of the Emperor's lieutenant to endeavour to effect his object. So far, however, was this project from being effected, that Platina, the historian of the Popes, (who was librarian of the Vatican under Pope Sixtus IV.) in his life of Pope Stephen IX., distinctly admits that Milan subsequently entirely withdrew itself from communion with the Church of Rome for 200 years together; and we find from ecclesiastical history that it was with difficulty reduced to submission, even by the all-powerful Hildebrand (afterwards Gregory

\* Rufini Aquileiensis Presbyteri Histor. Eccles., lib. I., c. 6, p. 236. Eccles. Hist. auctores Basil 1567. Can. vi. "Et ut apud Alexandriam et in urbe Roma, vultu consuetudo servetur, ut vel ille Egypti, vel hic Suburbanicam ecclesiasticam sollicitudinem gerat."

—Labbe and Cois. Con. Gen. tom. 2, p. 55.

\* Justellus and Voellus Codex Canonum Eccl. Universæ. Paris, 1682. P. 284. Constituta Concilii Nicenæ. VI. De primatu Eccles. Romæ, vel aliarum civitatum episcoporum. "Antiqui moris est ut urbis Romanæ Episcopus habeat principatum, ut Suburbanicæ loca, et omnem provinciam sua sollicitudine gubernet, que vero apud Egyptum sunt, Alexandriæ Episcopus omnium habeat sollicitudinem. Similiter autem et circa Antiochiam et in cœteris provinciis privilegia propria serventur metropolitanis Ecclesiis."

\* Bibliotheca Juris Canon. Veteris.—Tom. II. Voellus et Justellus. Ed. Paris, 1682, p. 678. Alex. Aristides. Synodi Nicenæ, l. 7. Alexandrinus Episcopus super Egyptum, Lybiam, et Pentapolim potestatem habet, et Romanus super eos qui Romæ subditi sunt. Kai o Πάτρις τῶν ὑπὸ Πάτριον.

\* Anonius, a poet who flourished in the fourth century, under the Emperor Gratian, in his *Ordo Nobilium Urbium*, ranks Milan as the 4th city in the world.—Corpus Vet. Poet. Tom. II., p. 1300. Lond. 1721.

\* Et Mediolani mira omnia, copia rerum,

Omnia que magni operum velut æmula formis

Excellunt; nec juncta premit vicinia Romæ."

Procopius, the Greek historian, who wrote in the 6th century, describes Milan as then excelling all the cities of the world, except Rome, in size, population, and wealth.—De Bello Gothico, Lib. II., c. 7, ad finem, tom. I., p. 466. Paris, 1662.

\* Epistle of Pope Pelagius I. A.D. 555. Joanni Patrio Cabur-tario inter cetera. "Is mos antiquus fuit, ut quia pro longinquitate vel difficultate itineris ab apostolico onerosum illis fuerat ordinari, ipsi se invicem Mediolanensis et Aquileiensis ordinare Episcopi debuerunt."

—Labbe and Cois. tom. 8. col. 805.

\* Epist. Valeriano Patrio. Ibid. p. 807.

\* Stephanus IX. pontificatum adeptus, statim curavit ut Mediola-nensis ecclesia quæ a Romanis ducentis fere annis subtraxerat, nunc demum eidem ottemperaret.—Plat. de Vit. Pont. p. 123. Colon. 1529.

VII.), about the year 1059. Peter Damian in that year was sent by Pope Nicholas II. to interpose on his behalf in a period of great disturbance; and Cardinal Baronius tells us that the interference of Damian, instead of being at once submitted to, was met by a popular clamour, led on by the clergy, "that the Ambrosian Church ought not to be subject to the laws of Rome; that the Pope had no power of judging or ordering matters in that See; and that it would be a great indignity if that Church, which under their ancestors had been always free, should now, to their extreme reproach (which God forbid), become subject to another Church." Baronius goes on to tell us that "the clamour increased; the people grew into a higher ferment; the bells were rung; the episcopal palace beset; the legate threatened with death;" and this, remember, in the middle of the eleventh century, on the very eve of the accession of Pope Hildebrand to the Papal throne. We think these are pretty clear proofs that the See of Rome, whether considered in its metropolitan, patriarchal, or apostolical character, was not acknowledged to be the mother and mistress of all Churches, even by the adjacent city of Milan, at least up to the middle of the eleventh century, and, we believe, to the present day it preserves several traces of its ancient independence.

Let us next turn to Aquileia, a famous city of Friuli (not far from Trieste), which was long considered the key of Italy, and had been the residence of Augustus and other Roman Emperors, and was afterwards itself made the seat of a Prætorian prefect, and ultimately a Patriarchate, A.D. 570.

We have already seen that neither the Bishops of Milan or Aquileia sought ordination from Rome, but that they mutually ordained each other; and though Pope Pelagius, in the epistle already referred to, insinuates that this was done only to save the trouble and charge of a journey to Rome, yet the learned Peter De Marca, Archbishop of Paris, honestly confesses that the true reason was, that Milan being the head of the *Italic Diocese*, the ordaining of the Metropolitan of Aquileia belonged to him as Primate; and the ordaining the Primate of Milan belonged to him of Aquileia, as being the first metropolitan of the diocese of Italy.

We find, however, that Pope Gregory I., about the end of the sixth century, made a vigorous attempt to subdue Aquileia to his jurisdiction by an armed force; and Baronius gives us the written remonstrance of the Bishop of Aquileia and his provincial synod, addressed to the Emperor Mauricius, A.D. 590, against the attempt of Pope

\* Nihil digna Sedis Apostolicæ veneratione receptis, ac negotia, que nos attraxerant, intimatis; post dem alterum factione clericorum repente in populo tumultu exortitur. "Non debere Ambrosianam Ecclesiam Romanis legibus subiacere; nullamque judicandam vel disponendam vim Romanis Pontificibus illi sede competere. Nihil indignum, inquit, ut que sub progenitoribus nostris semper extitit libera, ad nostre confusionis opprobrium nunc alteri (quod absit) Ecclesie sit subiecta." Postremo tumultuantium clamor attonitum, ex diversis partibus ad Episcopale palatium convenit; dein tintinnabula perstrinxit, progrediens crevit tubæ, que illic erat, tota civitas clangoribus intonat. Latentabant mihi, (ut ille loqueretur) omnia mortem, et ut ab amicis meis mihi sæpe suggestum est, nonnulli meum sanguinem attulerant."—Baron. Annals, tom. xi., p. 262. A.D. 1089, n. 43.

\* A curious proof that the Church of Milan was not in his time guided by the usages of Rome may be taken from St. Augustine (Ep. 26, n. 31, ad Casulanum, tom. II., p. 80, Ben. Ed., 1679), where he tells us that the Roman and some of the Western Churches kept the Sabbath (Saturday) a fast, but that it was otherwise at Milan (p. 81, n. 28) where it was observed as a festival. St. Augustine also tells us that when only a catechumen he went to consult St. Ambrose, for the sake of his mother, Monica, who was disturbed in her mind by observing the difference between what was done at Rome and Milan. St. Ambrose told him he could give him no better advice in the case than to do as he himself did, "for when I go to Rome," said he, "I fast on the Saturday, as they do at Rome; when I am here I do not fast." From this, no doubt, arose the old proverb, "When at Rome, do as they do at Rome." "Mater mea Mediolanum me comsecuta, invenit Ecclesiam Sabbato non jejunantem, cooperat, perturbat et fluctuat quid ageret: cum ego talia non curarem, sed propter ipsam consuli de hac re beatissimi memoris virum Ambrosium; respondit mihi nihil se decere me posse, nisi quod ipse faceret, quia si melius nosset, id potius observaret. Cumque ego putarem, nulla reddita ratione auctoritate sola sua nos vellet admoovere ne Sabbato jejunarem, subsecutus est, et ait mihi: 'Cum Romanam venio, jejunio Sabbato; cum hic sum, non jejunio. Hoc cum matris remississimæ, honestæ amplexæ est.'—Ep. liv., ad Januari-um, tom. II., p. 124, s. 7. Ben. Ed.

\* For instance, the Ambrosian ritual is almost the only national liturgy in the West which has been spared by the Roman Church, and the Rito or Culto Ambrosiano, is still in use throughout the whole of the ancient Archbishopric of Milan. Several attempts have been made to introduce the Roman service in its place, but they have been foiled by the attachment of the clergy and the people to their ancient rite. The Scriptures, too, are not read from the Vulgate, but from the ancient version called the *Itala*, which preceded that made by St. Jerome. Several other minor differences in the ceremonies are also anxiously retained, extending even to the shape of the censers or turl-bols.

\* Anonius treats it as the ninth city in the world in his day.

\* Nona inter claras Aquileia celebris urbes.

Italia ad Illyricos objecta colonia montes"—p. 1301.

Yet such is the transitory nature of human affairs, that it is now scarcely to be found upon any map. It still has, however, the empty honour of giving its name to a patriarch (who does not even reside there, but at Udine), the primate of Istria, and metropolitan of the Bishops of Treviso, Padua, Vicenza, Como, Verona, Trieste, &c.

\* Petri de Marca. De concordia sacerdotii et imperii. Paris, 1703 (p. 853, lib. 6, c. 4, s. 7). "Ambrosii sane Mediolanensis episcopi electio et ordinatio, quæ facta est a synodo totius Italiæ decreto Imperatoris Valentianus coacta, evincit nihil juris per illas tempestates Romano Pontifici competitivæ in ordinatione Metropolitanæ Mediolanensis, a qua manus abstulit per multum ævi, sero usurpata ejus ordinatione. . . . Pelagius insinuat tamen nititur hanc consuetudinem introducere esse vitandis sumptibus qui electo incumbunt si Romam pro ordinatione accedere cogeretur; cum vera hujus instituti ratio in eo consistat, quod cum Mediolanum esset caput Diocesis Italiæ, ut constat ex Concilio Aquileiensi, ordinatio Metropolitanæ Aquileiænsis ad Episcopum Mediolanensem optimo jure pertinebat, Primate vero Mediolanensis ordinatio ad Aquileiensem Episcopum, quod primus esset inter Metropolitanos Synodi generalis Diocesis Italiæ."

Gregory, in which they set forth the state of their case and the unjust and violent proceedings of the Pope, and plainly tell the Emperor that they had at the time of their ordination sworn obedience to their Metropolitan, which they never had nor would violate; and that unless his Majesty was pleased to remove this compulsion, their successors would not be suffered to come to Aquileia for ordination, but would be forced to fly to the *Archbishops of France*, as being next at hand, to receive it there.\*

That the Bishops of Aquileia, therefore, were ignorant of any title in the Roman See to be considered their lawful ecclesiastical head, and that they were on the contrary determined to the uttermost to dispute the Papal aggression, with which they were, for the first time, threatened at the close of the sixth century, is as plain as history can make it. The ideas of Rome, or of its devoted historian Baronius, upon the subject are, of course, a different matter; and when the Emperor complied with the remonstrance, and wrote to the Pope commanding him to cease the prosecution, and to give the Aquileian Bishops no further trouble, Baronius cannot restrain his indignation and rage both against the Bishops and the Emperor. The historical fact, however, is not the less clear, that the Bishops of Aquileia would rather have acknowledged the superiority of the Patriarch of Gaul than that of the Roman Pontiff so late as the year 590.

Let us now turn to *Ravenna*, another city of great importance, which from the reign of Honorius had been for some time the residence of the Roman Emperors, and was subsequently the seat of the Gothic and Longobard kings, and the constant residence of the Exarchs of Italy in the declining times of the empire. The Bishops of Ravenna, so far from acknowledging allegiance to the Bishops of Rome, for some ages disputed even their precedence, which was generally acknowledged even where their primacy was disputed, in which they were not unfrequently supported by the Exarchs. Not to tire out the patience of our readers, we must be contented with giving a single instance.

In the year 649, Maurus, Archbishop of Ravenna, succeeded to that See.† He was consecrated by three bishops of his own province, ordained his own provincial bishops, and was so far from seeking any confirmation from the Bishop of Rome, that Hieronymus Rubenius, the historian of Ravenna, tells us he received the pall from the Emperor.‡ This gave great offence to Pope Martin I., and his successor Eugenius I., but they were obliged to put up with it. The successor of Eugenius, however, Pope Vitalian, determined, if possible, to reduce Ravenna to subjection (just as Pelagius had in vain endeavoured to reduce Milan, and Gregory I. Aquileia), and actually went so far as to summon Maurus to appear at Rome, which he refused to do; whereupon the Pope excommunicated him. But so little was the patriarchal or apostolical jurisdiction of the Pope then thought of at Ravenna, that Archbishop Maurus took the liberty of replying by, in return, excommunicating Vitalian—a proceeding which, of course, horrifies Cardinal Baronius, but which he admits that Maurus never repented of, though he lived more than twenty years afterwards, as he goes on to tell us that upon his death-bed Maurus bound his clergy never to submit themselves to the Bishop of Rome. Archbishop Repa-

ratus followed in the same steps, and in the year 708 procured the Emperor's rescript to free the Church of Ravenna from any subjection to the Roman See. We might show that the same courage in resisting Papal encroachments was afterwards evinced by several of his successors; but we think we have shown proof enough that neither Milan, Aquileia, or Ravenna, or any of their dependencies, were for many centuries subject in any way to the jurisdiction of the See of Rome; but that, on the contrary, they sturdily resisted all attempts to subjugate them to its power.

Let us now pause for a while, and reflect for a moment on the importance of what we have thus incontestably proved by undoubted historic facts—facts taken, be it observed, not from Protestant historians, but from Roman Catholic writers of established reputation, who, as devoted servants of the Church of Rome, viewed with horror such attempts of other sees to preserve their ancient independence, and do not disguise their feelings of triumph at the ultimate, though tardy, subjection of those very churches to the Roman See.

We ask what sort of supremacy could the See of Rome have enjoyed, even in Italy, during the sixth, seventh, and so late even as the tenth centuries, when the bishops of such cities as *Milan, Ravenna, and Aquileia* so long and so stoutly maintained their complete independence of it? when the Ambrosian Church of *Milan*, for two hundred years together, actually refused to hold communion with the Church of Rome? when an Archbishop of *Ravenna* could, with perfect impunity, excommunicate a Pope, and retain his see till the hour of his death, nearly a quarter of a century afterwards, and even, on his deathbed, pledge his clergy never to yield to the encroachments of Rome? and when the Bishops of *Aquileia* could, in such a solemn document of remonstrance as we have quoted, boldly inform the Emperor that they would rather resort to the Bishops of *France* for ordination than accept it from *Rome*?

We should really like to be informed how Cardinal Wiseman or Father Newman would have their followers deal with such stubborn proofs that the boasted universal supremacy of Rome was unknown in those days. Are devout Romanists to refuse credence to their own ecclesiastical historians, or simply, without disputing, to shut their eyes to, admitted facts, and ignore what they cannot answer, as they so often have done before with respect to awkward facts and embarrassing arguments brought forward in our pages?

It may possibly be the best policy of such leaders to affect not to observe the progress of enlightenment going on among their nominal adherents, and to abstain altogether from any attempt to reply, where they feel it to be impossible to reply successfully, or even in such a way as to avoid a disgraceful defeat. But we warn them that they must sooner or later pay the penalty of defeat, where they have not courage to defend the assumptions of their Church. We do not write this in any boastful temper or spirit of premature triumph; but believing earnestly that we have truth on our side, and knowing our own earnest sincerity and anxious desire to get at solid and real truth, while tolling on from year to year at the original fountains of ecclesiastical knowledge, and boldly publishing to the world the exact places where others may with ease verify for themselves everything we assert or rely on, we cannot suppress an occasional smile at the forced silence of our long-suffering opponents, and treat that silence as, what it really is, the profoundest homage they could offer to the cause of truth.

When we proceed, as we hope to do in our next number, to consider the case of other Churches, we think our readers will agree with us that *Aeneas Sylvius*, afterwards Pope Pius II., was not far astray when he candidly admits that "before the time of the Nicene Council, at least (he might, indeed, have added, to a much later period), very little regard was had to the Church of Rome."‡

#### HOW LARRY O'DONOVAN SPENT THE LORD'S DAY; OR, HOW MANY THINGS MAY BE DONE ON SUNDAY WITHOUT MORTAL SIN.

LARRY O'DONOVAN was a smart, lively young man, who lived near the town of Ballydowney. The possession of a small farm, on which he worked, enabled him to support an aged mother, and brother, and sister. Like many another man, he complained that the times were bad, and it was hard to find money for every call; and when he provided food for his family there was not much remaining wherewith he could buy clothes. He observed to his sorrow that his coat was becoming more shabby and ragged every week, so that at last he was ashamed to face the flock, and he had to remain at home whilst others were at mass. What could he do; men of his small means seldom have much money during the summer months, and no one would give him a coat without cash.

One Saturday evening, in September, he was passing the

cloth shop of his neighbour, John Carty, and he saw inside the door a nice new coat, which he looked at with admiring if not with covetous eyes. But, alas, a notice was posted up in the shop, "No Credit Given." He pressed his neighbour to let him have the coat; "I'll pay you surely the first oats I sell." "No cash, no coat," said the stiff shopkeeper. "If you have not money, maybe you have value. Did I not see you with some nice early potatoes. Give me 30 stone of the roots, and the coat shall be yours." "Done," said Larry; "but sure it is too late to put a spade in them now, and I want a coat to go to early mass to-morrow." "No potatoes, no coat," said John Carty.

A bright thought struck Larry, and with great glee he rubbed his hands together, and exclaimed, "I'll manage it all."

Early in the morning he called up his brother and sister, and told them to bring a couple of spades, and some sacks to the field. "What humour has taken you now?" said Mary. "Don't you remember it is Sunday morning, and sure the field is close to the road, and there's never a Christian passing the way but will wonder at our working on this holy day." "Give none of your cheek," says Larry; "do what you are bid." So they went out and began to work.

After a little time, James Jones, the Scripture-reader, passed along the road. "Good morrow, Larry." "Good morrow kindly." "I am sorry to see you at that work; for I thought you had some little respect for the commandments of God, who hath taught us to keep holy the Sabbath day." "I am doing no great harm," says Larry; "but your religion and mine differ, and I am only doing what the clergy allow." "And do they let you dig potatoes for sale; won't the priest be angry when you tell him this in your confession." "I'll never confess it at all, for it is no mortal sin." Whereupon he pulled out of his pocket a little book called, "What Every Christian must Know and Do," by the Rev. J. Furniss, a Redemptorist Father, and approved of by Archbishop Cullen. "See here, on the third commandment he says, 'It is a mortal sin to work for about 2 hours or 2½ hours on Sunday.' I'll be done all my work here," said Larry, "in 1½ hours, and that won't make a mortal sin."

Before two hours was over he had carried the potatoes to John Carty, and got possession of his new coat.

The week before all this had happened Larry had been at confession, and as his reverence was by no means pleased with him, he told him he must read the Penitential Psalms three times over as a penance.

Larry cleaned himself, put on the new coat, and got ready for mass. He took with him his "Path to Paradise." "I'll kill two birds with one stone. I'll get the benefit of the mass, and I'll perform my penance all at one time." After he reached the chapel he made his bow before the crucifix, and the priest commenced the mass, and Larry began at the seven Penitential Psalms. Those poor misguided creatures, the Protestants, think that if they are to get any good from their church service they must attend to the prayers, and join in them, and say Amen, but Larry's little book, "What Every Christian must Know and Do," told him it was not necessary, and that whilst the priest is saying mass a man may read his "Penance" or any the heads.—See p. 21, Commandment iii.

Larry was a good scholar, and by the time the priest had finished the mass he had read the seven Psalms three times. "My business is done," said Larry, as he walked out of the chapel, "and my penance is performed."

He was a smart fellow in other ways, and had no small taste for music, and he had spent last winter's evenings in learning to play the flute, which he hoped to turn to some account.

The neighbours were very fond of dancing, and many a lively tune could Larry play. When the second mass was over, he called on Jack Stack, who had a good sized clean kitchen at the end of the town. "Jack, will you let me play a little here, for the boys and girls to dance, and I will give you every fourth penny I make." "That I will," says Jack; and before long the youngsters came in, and for a couple of hours they kept it up, and each gave two or three pence, and Larry found he had made four shillings.

Still here no harm was done, for Mr. Furniss and Paul Cullen taught him that it is "not a servile work to play music on Sunday," and "if a person does on Sunday what is not a servile work, it is no harm to be paid for it."—p. 20, 21.

Larry had now his money in his pocket, and who was better entitled to a bit of meat for dinner than he, after all his hard work at the potatoes and the flute.

He called at Patt Sheahan's to see what he had in his stall. Patt was, like himself, an obedient Roman, and would not dispose of a pound of meat only the bishop had said it was no harm to sell on Sunday, and Mr. Furniss had taught Larry it was no harm to buy on Sunday, if there be any custom permitted by the bishop.—p. 20.

The bargain was soon made, and Larry carried home the mutton to his mother, and in a short time the chops were smoking hot before him, and he enjoyed his dinner heartily.

His labours, however, had not ended. As he was sitting outside the door enjoying the pleasant afternoon, his landlord, Mr. Jerry O'Connell, called on him and offered him a couple of shillings if he would run over to Mr. Fitzgerald, the attorney, who lived at Tullagh, and ask him to come to

\* Baron. Annals tom. viii., p. 14 n. 39, 42. A.D. 590. "Suggerimus etiam, pie dominator, quia tempore ordinationis nostrae, unusquisque sacerdos in sancta sede Aquileiensis cautionem scriptis emitimus studiosae fidei ordinatoris nostri, nos fidei integram Sanctae Relp. servaturus; quod ipse novit Dominus, nos fidei tot corde et servasse, et huc usque jugiter conservare. Sic centuratio ista et compulso plis jussionibus vestris remota non fuerit, si quem de nobis qui nunc esse videmus defungi contingeret, nullo piebium nostrarum ad ordinationem Aquileiensis Ecclesiae post hoc patereur accedere; sed quia Galliarum Archiepiscopi vicini sunt, ad ipsorum sine dubio ordinationem accurrent."†

† That he was acknowledged at Rome as Archbishop is plain, for his legates were received at the Council of Lateran, which was summoned against the Monothelites, in A.D. 649, in the time of Pope Martin I. The canons were subscribed by 105 Bishops, of whom the 3 first, among whom were the legates of Archbishop Maurus, were as follows:

1. Maximus, the most holy Bishop of Aquileia.  
2. Deusdedit, the most holy Bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia.  
3. Mauro Cosenate Episcopo et Deusdedit presbytero agentibus locum Mauri Sanctissimi Episcopi Ravennatis Ecclesiae.

All the rest sign as plain Bishops, and it is observable that the Bishop of Milan is not among them.—Labbe and Coss., Con. Gen. tom. 6, p. 75, 77.

"Ipse (Maurus) sagaci et peracri vir ingenio, multas cum Pont. Max. similitudines exercebat; nam concedente Constante, Ravennatem Ecclesiam, ab Romana, quae Ecclesiarum omnium est caput, ita distinxit, ut Episcopos sibi subjectos ipse consecraret, a tribus autem suae ditionis Episcopis consecraretur, neque ulla ab Romano Pontifice confirmatio peteretur, verum pallium a Caesare acciperet. Vitalianus Signinus Pont. Max. creatus, A.D. 652. Hic cum jam diu nimiam Archiepiscopi Ravennatum petulantiam, odio et indignatione habuisset, statim Pontifex creatus, Maurum Archiepiscopum Romanum se ad vocat, causam suam dicturum. Id cum Maurus negligeret sacris ab Vitaliano est interdictus. Sed Maurus, Diocorum Alexandrinum Antistitem, a Concilio Chalcedonensi ob id damnatum, imitatus, contrario litteras ad Vitalianum dedit, et eidem sacris interdictis; nulla unquam sceleris conscientia, dum vixit, ab hac nefaria opinione deductus. . . . Moriens sacerdotis suos monuit ne Romano Pontifici unquam subirent. p. 207. Sedit annos ferme 24. Obiit aetate A.D. 672. Cui Reparus succedit; a tribus subjectis sibi Episcopis, Ravennae, in Divi Petri, more Pontificis Maximi, Archiepiscopus consecratur. Byzantium ad Constantinum IV. Caesarem, profectus est, a quo postulatis suis, quibus petebat, dominatu Romano Pontificis Ravennates Archiepiscopos liberari, abunde fuit satisfactus."—Hist. Ravennat., Hieronymo Rubeno, lib. iv., p. 205. Venet. 1860.

Baronius Annal. tom. 8, p. 605, ad an. 669. "Prodit idem auctor (Rubenus) ex Ravennatis Ecclesiae monumentis, a Vitaliano Papa excommunicatum fuisse Maurum Episcopum Ravennatem, quod ab ipso Romano vocatus causam dicturus, adesse contempserit. At ille tantum abiecit ut percussus anathemate respuerit, ut etiam fretus Archiepiscopi potentia, quem sibi intimum conciliaverat amicum, eo vesanie progressus sit, ut in Vitalianum eandem anathematis sententiam reciprocet. . . . Ceterum quo cepit mentis delirio

Maurus perseverans, nec mutans Aethiops pellem suam, ad finem vitae perductus, contestatur esse omnes Ravennatis Ecclesiae clericos, ne unquam subirent se Romano Pontifici. . . . Porro in locum Mauri subrogatus est Reparatus, qui et ipse refractarius laboravit perficere per Imperatoris rescriptum, ne subiaceret ecclesiae illa Romana."‡

‡ Martino Mayer, S.P.D. "Quemadmodum factum esse videmus ante concilium Nicenum, dum sibi quisque vivebat, et ad Romanam Ecclesiam parvus habebatur respectus."—Epist. 288, p. 802. Opera. Aen. Sylv. Basil. 1571.